REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3, 5-55, 57-111 and 113-131. No amendment to the claims has been made and hence claims 1-3, 5-55, 57-111 and 113-131 remain pending in this application.

Claim Rejections 35 USC § 103

In paragraph 1 of the pending Office Action, claims 1-3, 5-7, 17-18, 22-23, 29-31, 33-42, 49-55, 57-61, 71-72, 83-85, 87-100, 103-111, 113-115 and 125-131 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ackley (USPN 6,152,370) in view of Teufel et al. (USPN 6243503) and Ito et al. (USPN 5,612,720).

The rejection is respectfully traversed. The Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has not shown that the cited prior art references disclose, teach or suggest all of the limitations of the claims. In particular, Ackley is directed to an improved method for reading and encoding bar code symbols. The disclosure of Ackley is particularly related to the creation of an improved data acquisition device permitting memory-optimised acquisition of any desired information available in the plane of a picture free of any direction of motion preset for such acquisition. The coded data in Ackley is merely in the form of bar codes.

Ackley does not disclose, teach or suggest "coded data indicative of an identity of the interface surface and of a plurality of reference points of the interface surface..". Indeed, Ackley makes no reference as to the function of the coded data (i.e. bar codes) or any features associated with the coded data as the disclosure of Ackley is directed towards an improved data acquisition device (i.e. an improved barcode reader). This is in contrast to the Applicant's invention which relates to "..a method.." and system "..of enabling user interaction with computer software via an interface surface.." wherein the interface surface has "...disposed therein or thereon coded data indicative of an identity of the interface surface and of a plurality of reference points of the interface surface..".

The Examiner asserts that while Ackley does not teach generating data indicative of the sensing device's position relative to the interface surface, Teufel teaches a motion detector unit for recording the given position of the data acquisition device relative to the image plane. Applicant asserts that Teufel is merely directed to a data acquisition device for reading traditional printed media and correctly capturing these images when the data acquisition device is in movement over the interface plane. Teufel does not disclose, teach or suggest an interface surface having disposed therein or thereon coded data indicative of an identity of the interface surface and of a plurality of the reference points of the interface surface.

Furthermore, Teufel does not disclose, teach or suggest a sensing device which contains identifying data indicative of an identity of a user and which is able to generate indicating data, indicative of the identity of the interface surface and of a position of the sensing device relative to the interface surface, using at least some of the coded data.

Hence, Ackley as modified by Teufel does not teach all of the limitations of the Applicant's invention.

Examiner states that Ackley does not disclose a sensing device having a memory containing identifying data indicative of an identity of a user. However, the Examiner asserts that Ackley as modified by Ito will result in such a device. Ito is directed to an LCD display unit that has the capacity to recognise two or more users handwriting inputs at substantially the same time.

Applicant respectfully asserts that Ito is directed to a distinct technology field to that of the Applicants invention. Furthermore, Applicant again respectfully draws to the Examiners attention that Ito does not disclose, teach or suggest the limitation of the Applicant's invention of an interface surface having disposed therein or thereon coded data indicative of an identity of the interface surface and of a plurality of reference points of the interface surface.

Furthermore, Ito does not disclose, teach or suggest a sensing device which contains identifying data indicative of an identity of a user and which is able to generate indicating data, indicative of the identity of the interface surface and of a position of the sensing device relative to the interface surface, using at least some of the coded data.

As such, Ackley as modified by Ito does not teach all of the features of the Applicants invention.

Hence, the Applicant's invention, as defined in independent claims 1, 53, 54, 109 and 110 includes the limitations of an interface surface having disposed therein or thereon coded data indicative of an identity of the interface surface and of a plurality of reference points of the interface surface and a sensing device which contains identifying data indicative of an identity of a user and which is able to generate indicating data, indicative of the identity of the interface surface and of a position of the sensing device relative to the interface surface, using at least some of the coded data. These limitations are not disclosed, taught or suggested by the cited prior art references, either alone or in combination. The claims dependent upon claims 1, 53, 54, 109 and 110 are similarly limited and hence are allowable. Therefore Applicant respectfully submits that this rejection has been traversed. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

In paragraph 2 of the pending Office Action, claims 8-16, 19-21, 24-28, 32, 43-48, 62-70, 73, 74-82, 101-102 and 116-124 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ackley (USPN 6,152,370) in view of Teufel et al. (USPN 6243503) and Ito et al. (USPN 5,612,720), and in further view of Wright, Jr. (USPN 5, 704, 029).

Examiner asserts that Ackley as modified by Teufel and/or Ito does not teach the use of interactive elements. Examiner asserts that it would be obvious to one skilled in the art that to further modify Ackley in view of Wright to teach all of the claimed features of the Applicant's invention.

Wright teaches a computer system and method for creating computerized forms and transferring these forms to a Personal Digital Assistant (PDA). Wright does not disclose, teach or suggest an interface surface having disposed therein or thereon coded data indicative of an identity of the interface surface and of a plurality of reference points of the interface surface.

Furthermore, Wright does not disclose, teach or suggest a sensing device which contains identifying data indicative of an identity of a user and which is able to generate indicating data, indicative of the identity of the interface surface and of a position of the sensing device relative to the interface surface, using at least some of the coded data.

Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has not shown that the limitations of the claims are disclosed, taught or suggested by the prior art references, either alone or in combination. As such, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are allowable and that no further grounds of rejection remain unaddressed.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that all of the Examiner's rejections have been successfully traversed. Accordingly, it is submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of the application is courteously solicited.

Very respectfully,

PAUL LAPSTUN

Applicant:

KIA SILVERBROOK

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
393 Darling Street
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com

Telephone: +612 9818 6633

Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762